

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Of those, claims 1, 10 and 16 are independent. Claims 23-25 have been added.

§112, First Paragraph, Rejection

✓ The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 34 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement. Based upon the Examiner's explanation of the rejection, it seems as though this rejection would have been more appropriately made under §112, second paragraph. Regardless, Applicant has made a few clarifying changes to claim 9, which are believed to resolve the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

§103 Rejection

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,794,520 to Kobus, Jr. et al. (the Kobus patent) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,081 to Gase (the Gase patent).

In particular, the Examiner asserts that the Kobus patent differs only from independent claim 1 by not disclosing a liaison interface to handle communications from the plurality of end user devices. But the Examiner believes that this is disclosed by the Gase patent and further believes that it would have been obvious to modify the Kobus patent according to the Gase patent. Applicant disagrees. ✓

Claim 1 recites a liaison interface to handle communications from said plurality of end user devices that are intended for said monitoring interface and to handle communications from said monitoring interface that correspond to said communications from said end user devices, respectively. Assuming for the sake of argument that the Gase patent discloses a liaison interface to handle communications from a monitoring interface to end user devices, the Gase patent nevertheless fails to disclose that the same liaison interface handles communications from the plurality of end user devices that are intended for the monitoring interface, for the following reasons.

The Examiner has asserted that the network 26 of Fig. 1 of the Gase patent corresponds to the claimed liaison interface. This appears to be a typographical error; instead, it seems in substance as though the Examiner has interpreted the primary application 30 running on the client 24 as corresponding to the claimed liaison interface. Inspection of Figure 1 (and Figure 2 for that matter) reveals that packets are sent from the broadcasting server 22 to the primary application 30 and the secondary applications 32(1), 32(2) and 32(N). But no packets are depicted as being sent from the primary application 30 or the secondary applications 32(i) at all, much less to the server 22.

This is not surprising. The Gase patent is simply an application of a broadcasting technique to a port, with the resultant effect being a one-way or unidirectional sharing of the port, e.g., contested ported 34. In more detail, the primary application 30 listens for packets at port 34 not only on its own behalf, but also on behalf of the secondary applications 32(i), which desire to listen for the same packets as the primary application 30. When the primary application 30 receives a packet, it delivers a copy of that packet over the registration port 36 to the secondary applications 32(i).

In other words, the primary application broadcasts the packet it receives at contested port 34 to the secondary applications 32(i) over the registered port 36. Thus, assuming for the sake of argument that the primary application 30 partially acts like a liaison interface (in terms of handling communications from the server 22 intended for the secondary applications 32(i)), it is unreasonable to interpret the primary application 30 as handling communications from the secondary applications 32(i) that are intended for the server 22. Thus, a liaison interface that handles communications from a plurality of end user devices intended for a monitoring device, as well as vice-versa (communications from the monitoring device that correspond to the communications from the end user devices, respectively) represents a distinction over the Gase patent; such a liaison interface is recited in independent claim 1.

Independent claim 10 recites a liaison unit that is similar to the liaison interface of claim 1. Independent claim 16 recites handling communications in a manner similar to how the liaison interface of claim 1 operates. And claim 22 recites a program embodied upon a computer readable medium that causes a server to implement, among other things, the handling of communications recited in independent method claim 16. As such, each of independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 22 recite a distinction over the Gase patent.

For the reasons given above, the §103 rejection over the combination of the Kobus patent as modified by the Gase patent is improper. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims 23-25

Again, claims 23-25 have been added by this reply. At least by their dependency from claims 1, 10 and 16, respectively, new claims 23-25 are considered patentable.

CONCLUSION

The issues in the case were considered to be resolved. Accordingly, Applicant again requests a Notice of Allowability.

Person to Contact

In the event that any matters remain at issue in the application, the Examiners are invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 668-8000 in the Northern Virginia area, for the purpose of a telephonic interview.

Three Month Extension

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.117 and 1.136(a), Applicant respectfully petitions for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the above-identified application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Thomas S. Auchterlonie

Reg. No. 37,275

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000

TSA:dg:tsa